

GAP-DGB NFNP: Screen-Transference Memories, Phantasies, and Symptoms (TICs, TIPs): Allusions to Immediacy-Transference Constructions/Projections

David Gordon Bain*

DGB Transportation Services, DGB Integrative Wellness and Education Services, Canada

*Corresponding Author: David Gordon Bain, DGB Transportation Services, DGB Integrative Wellness and Education Services, Canada.

Received: August 24, 2017; Published: October 06, 2017

Code: GAP-DGB: Gestalt-Adlerian-Psychoanalytic;

Code: NFNP; Neo-Freudian, Neo-Psychoanalysis;

August 22nd, 2017,

Good afternoon everyone,

If I get carried away with some of my acronyms -- which I know I do, it seems to be a 'semi-compulsion' which can leave me shaking my head the next day (consequently, the disappearance of the last essay that used to be here) -- please have patience with me, as we sort through the ones that might be useful vs. the ones that should be scrapped. For every ten bad ones, I might get one or two good ones...if that..

We are moving into new theoretical territory of a 'dialectically interactive and integrative' nature which adheres to the 'Neo-Hegelian Multi-BiPolar, Multi-Dialectical Philosophy-Psychology' which I have been using right from the very beginning since my interview with Masson back in 2010. Masson, in the interview, reflected back 29 years later on 'The Seduction Theory Controversy-Scandal' of 1981 that ended his career as 'The Projects Director of The Freud Archives' after his removal from this position by Anna Freud, Kurt Eissler, and the other board members of the Freud Archives at the time.

My editorial opinion on the matter is much clearer now than it was seven years ago. Back then, all I knew that I wanted to do was to integrate Pre-Classical (Reality-Memory-Trauma-Seduction) Psychoanalytic Theory with Classical (Oedipal, Id, Ego, Superego, Fantasy, Childhood Sexuality, Wish, Impulse-Drive, Biological Instinct) Psychoanalytic Theory while adding other 'schools' of psychology into the 'whole mix' -- the 'Philosophy-Psychology Stew-Pot'. Thesis, anti-thesis, synthesis.

Dr. Masson wished me luck on this venture -- he didn't think I would succeed but he appreciated (at the time) my passion, spirit, and the fact that I believed that 'memories' were generally 'legitimate, real memories' and not 'distorted fantasies of memories'. It is not a completely 'either/or' 'us or them' scenario because we all add our own 'subjective, narcissistic biases' to the 'interpretation and recall of our memories' but not generally to the point where a woman is 'hugely distorting the memory of a childhood or adolescent sexual assault/seduction'.

In my mind, Freud knew fully well which side of his bread was 'battered' and after 1896 steered mainly away from the subject of childhood sexual abuse, more so the later and later it got in his career. Freud in 1932 was not the same theorist or therapist that he was in 1894, 95, and 96. As Dr. Masson has mentioned, Freud's thought process involving childhood sexual abuse slowly disappeared between about 1897 and 1905 -- even in Freud's 'Three Essays on Sexuality' (1905) Freud briefly mentioned the subject matter. But certainly not when Sandor Ferenczi, in Ferenczi's most important paper for two different reasons (one, the subject of 'inter-subjectivity' between analyst and client; and 2. the shocking -- and rejected totally by Freud -- introduction of the subject of trauma theory and childhood sexual abuse (seduction) theory into 'Oedipal Complex' theory in 1932. Masson wrote about this in 1984, 'The Assault on Truth: Freud's Suppression of The Seduction Theory' -- and that idea -- i.e., 'the dialectical integration of Seduction-Oedipal-Trauma-Defense-Fantasy Theory' -- has become the center of my Oedipal Period Complex work today as it has been evolving for years now since the Masson Interview of 2010.

Citation: David Gordon Bain. "GAP-DGB NFNP: Screen-Transference Memories, Phantasies, and Symptoms (TICs, TIPs): Allusions to Immediacy-Transference Constructions/Projections". *EC Psychology and Psychiatry* SPI.1 (2017): P35-P39.

So the difference between my viewpoint and Dr. Masson's as of 2010 was basically this: Masson believed that Pre-Classical and Classical Psychoanalysis could not be integrated -- and he believed that Pre-Classical Psychoanalysis was the 'better' of the two 'brands' of Psychoanalysis -- whereas, I was fully confident that I could dialectically integrate the two sets of theories which would make 'Psychoanalysis as a Whole' better than the 'either/or' of two bipolarly different parts, two bipolarly different brands of psychoanalysis -- especially when I added Object Relations, Transactional Analysis, Jungian Psychology, Adlerian Psychology, Gestalt Therapy, Humanistic-Existentialism, and Cognitive-Emotional-Behavior Theory -- all into the 'mix' -- the 'huge integrative stew-pot'. Again -- 'thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis only this time there were 'multiple bipolar theories' to contend with and integrate -- not just two.

Now, not being 'formally trained' in Psychoanalysis, I, for the most part, have had to work 'under the radar' of Psychoanalysis, and presented myself and my network of 'underground psychoanalytic-neo-psychoanalytic theories' as 'DGB NFNP'.

Back in Freud's early work between 1893 and 1896, Freud used the two words 'false connection' a lot -- in describing and defining 'transference', and also when describing and defining 'obsessions'. Indeed, it could be -- and I am -- easily argued that all of Freud's career work in psychoanalysis basically came down to the idea of 'searching out and helping clients recognize and address 'the false connections' in their 'neurotic symptoms' between the past (what I will call 'transference') and the present (what I will call 'immediacy' or 'here-and-now').

This, in my editorial opinion, is a much better way of understanding the assumptive and foundational basis of psychoanalysis than Freud's idea of 'repression'.

Repression was, and is, only one way -- indeed, arguably not even a very common way -- of 'generating the type of 'false, dissociative connections' that Freud was writing about when he wrote about 'repression' which really only amounted to one of many possible different 'mechanisms of defense' (and/or 'phantasy/fantasy') -- most notably 'transference' and most if not all 'neurotic symptoms' such as 'obsessions' and 'addictions' which I view as 'TIPS' (Transference-Immediacy Constructions) and 'TIPs' (Transference-Immediacy-Projections) and 'TIPS' (Transference-Immediacy-Projective-Sublimations). I also call these TICs -- 'Allusions to Underlying, usually Unconscious, Transference-Immediacy Oedipal-Id Complexes'.

Now, here we come to the crux of this paper: the difference and/or the dialectic integration of what Freud called 'Screen' Memories' -- both Masson and I hated this concept and this essay by Freud of 1899 -- until recently when I have changed -- or rather 'modified' -- my outlook on this highly controversial concept that introduces the idea of 'fantasy distortion' into 'childhood memories'.

Here is the controversial issue in a nutshell -- described in a way that you won't even hear or read psychoanalytic theorists talking or writing about it: Freud created the concept of 'transference' in 1895 and called it a 'false (love or hate) connection between patient and analyst' where the analyst (usually an older man) is seen in the 'projective-transference light' of a 'father-surrogate' to the client (usually a so-labelled 'hysterical' woman but sometimes an 'anal-obsessional' man, and sometimes even the reverse).

Back in 1896, the woman was usually seen by Freud as a 'passive childhood victim of sexual abuse' by usually the father, sometimes an older sibling, or some other family member or stranger'; whereas the 'obsessional' man was seen as an 'active perpetrator of childhood seduction/sexual abuse against a younger female child -- as an act of 'identification with the aggressor' in the shadow of having been molested himself and/or seen his father sexually abuse one of the other children -- and 'repeating' this act in the 'mold of his father'. Nothing wrong with that theory. It still happens.

However, with the creation of 'The Oedipal Complex' in 1897, (a private letter to Fliess in October of that year), and then having created the concept of 'Screen Memories' in 1899, where the idea of 'childhood fantasy distortion' took 'the truth value' out of 'alleged childhood sexual abuse memories', and not dealing with the subject of 'transference' very much if at all between 1895 and 1905 -- by the time Freud got to the 'Dora Case' of 1905, Freud had effectively changed his thinking 180 degrees from 'reality-memory-trauma-seduction' theory to

'fantasy-instinct or impulse-drive and Oedipal theory'. So he no longer thought that his 'childhood sexual abuse theory' -- especially when it involved the father -- was 'legit'. Instead, he thought that the generally female child was 'erotically fantasizing about her father' -- and this, in turn, was 'distorting' any 'truth value' in a female client 'remembering' an 'alleged' 'sexual abuse memory'. This change in thinking completely changed the face of psychoanalysis -- and over decades of time -- the credibility and reputation of psychoanalysts with the increasing political power of 'active feminists' -- and women as a whole who lost more and more respect for Freud and Freudian theory in the light of his Victorian, Patriarchal, Sexist ideas. Men were no longer carrying all the professional and political power. Still, in 1981, Masson got virtually no feminist support, no support from women, no support from 'egalitarian-minded men'. It was a crushing blow for Masson who just did not see the 'tidal wave of silence and non-support' coming...The man deserved much more support than he got -- but the simple reality is -- and was -- that in 1981, and still to a significant extent today -- no one really understood the huge 'complication' of the subject matter, and even for myself, this is the first time that I have been able to articulate the whole issue as clearly as I am now doing...It took me seven extra years to more fully what was going on historically...and psychoanalytically...and there are still some elements of 'Classical Fantasy' theory that deserve to be respected and taken seriously -- just not what Freud did with his 'Oedipal Complex Theory' -- arguably under the 'duress' of 'political and professional pressure'.

So, in this light, we come back to the subject of 'transference' and 'screen memories' and as I will now argue, the 'potential for interaction' between them.

According to Freud -- and I am extrapolating here -- if Freud had written 'Screen Memories' in 1896 when he wrote 'The Aetiology of Hysteria' -- or 'invented' the concept which he, in effect, did without giving it a 'name' within this essay -- a 'screen memory' would have been described and defined as any 'conscious memory' that both 'hides and alludes' to an 'underlying repressed memory' of the same 'structural-psycho-dynamics'. What Freud would have effectively called a 'screen memory' in 1896, Adler ended up calling a 'lifestyle memory' about three decades later in the 1920s. If the memory comes out of the Oedipal Period (2 years old to 7 years old), this is what I call an 'Oedipal-Lifestyle-Deathstyle Memory'.

You can see the influence of Freud's 'Beyond The Pleasure Principle' (1920 and 'death instinct' theory in the evolution of this concept. Also, what Adler called 'the lifestyle', Stekel called 'the life-lie'. So you start to get the idea that there are some 'false connections' in a person's 'Trauma-Fantasy Oedipal Complex' and/or his or her 'Lifestyle-Deathstyle' Personal Philosophy-Psychology.

Now, the concept of 'transference' has been used almost exclusively to describe a certain 'relationship phenomena' mainly between client and therapist -- and in the mold of its earliest meaning by Freud -- a 'false projective-connection' on the part of the client in either 'over-idealizing' the therapist and/or 'over-demonizing' the therapist/analyst.

The concept of transference has never -- I repeat -- never been used by either Freud or any other psychoanalytic theorist to describe what I call an 'Oedipal-Transference Memory'. What I am arguing here is that we all have what might also be called 'Post-Oedipal Transference Memories' that both hide and allude to an 'original Oedipal Transference Scene' -- the scene of the client's 'Oedipal Transference Memory' which may be 'distorted' very little, or it may be distorted a lot, depending on the psychological objectivity and health of the person-child both 'interpreting the events of the Oedipal Period Scene', and the person-adult 'recalling/remembering' the details of this scene decades later..

So, for our purposes here, a 'Post-Oedipal Transference Memory and/or Fantasy' can also be called a 'Post-Oedipal Screen Memory and/or Fantasy' for an earlier 'Oedipal Transference Scene'.

And here is the final kicker that I will close this essay with...

A type of 'psychological pathology' or a 'deathpath-symptom' like 'hoarding' or 'drug addiction' can have -- and usually does have -- both 'immediacy' and 'transference' ALLUSIONS to either a 'post-Oedipal Scene' and/or an 'Oedipal Scene' -- and generally both.

I remember one show on hoarding where a woman eventually 'attached' her 'hoarding impulse' to a scene when and where she was an adolescent and her aunt (or whoever was looking after her) 'threw her out of the house' but before she was evicted, the aunt took all the young girl's personal property and burned it in a bonfire.

Kind of gives a much more 'shocking' and 'traumatic' meaning to the 'pathology' of 'hoarding', doesn't it? This is getting closer to Arthur Janov's ideas of 'Primal Pain', 'The Primal Scream' and 'Primal Therapy'.

However, Janov arrived at the beginning of these 'clinical insights' in the context of a single session working with a patient in 1967. Freud was writing about 'non-sufficiently abreacted trauma' or 'the unfinished situation' in 1893 ('The Mechanisms of Hysteria'), and 'repressed memories' in 94 ('The Neuro-Psychoses of Defense'). This was over 70 years before the beginning of Janov's 'new Primal work' and about 50 years before Perls introduced 'Gestalt Therapy' to the world in the 1940s and 1950s.

Freud's work in 1896 ('The Aetiology of Hysteria') on 'the genealogy of memories' as being like 'the genealogy of a family tree' and 'fitting together' -- the 'co-operation of memories' -- like a 'child's picture puzzle' foreshadowed the work of Adler on 'lifestyle memories' about 30 years later.

Freud's 'splitting of consciousness' foreshadowed the beginning of Object Relations when Melanie Klein entered on the scene in the 1920s and more in the 1930s, as well as Eric Berne's work in 'Transactional Analysis' on 'ego-states' in the 1950s and 1960s.

All of these theorists 'rebelled' against Freud's 'Classical Theory' but obviously they did not read Freud's 'Pre-Classical Theory' because, if they did, they would have been quoting it as the foundation of their own work. So, to sum up, Freud's Pre-Classical Theory can be seen to have been the underlying foundation for: 1. Adlerian Theory; 2. Object Relations; 3. Gestalt Therapy; 4. Transactional Analysis; 5. Primal Therapy; and 6. -- I forgot one -- 'Cognitive Therapy' -- 'Neurosis is a defense against unbearable ideas.' (1894). And we can also say that Pre-Classical Psychoanalysis was the foundation for 7. Classical Psychoanalysis. And an assortment of other 'brands' of psychology and psychotherapy that are not coming to the top of my head now.

In short, at least seven -- count them 7 -- different 'schools' or 'brands' of psychology, psychoanalysis, and/or psychotherapy were 'built from the foundation of Freudian Pre-Classical Psychoanalysis. So when Masson put out the argument that the 'rejected, suppressed, ostracized, marginalized' first brand of psychoanalysis was, and is -- over time -- being proven to be the 'best' brand of psychoanalysis, he had, and still has, a very good argument to support this conclusion.

The only thing I say differently is that when you integrate Pre-Classical and Classical Psychoanalysis, you have the 'best brand of psychoanalysis of all'. I call this 'Greater Freudian Psychoanalysis'. And when you add in all the different 'schools' of psychology and psychotherapy that I have been influenced by over the last 45 years (1972-2017), you have DGB Neo-Freudian-Neo-Psychoanalysis.

So when so-called 'psychotherapy professionals' come up to me and ask me what I am doing writing about Freud -- and say that 'Freud is no longer relevant; his work has been debunked', I just shake my head and walk away. Obviously, these people have not read Freud's work between 1893 and 1896 -- and that his ideas within these volumes of his work are the 'hidden mainstream' of much of psychotherapy today.

The true brilliance and genius of Freud is in 'the wholism' of all 23 editions of his 'Complete Psychological Works' -- all of his essays working together in harmony -- not in conflict -- with -- or 'dissociation' from -- each other.

The best of Freud's work is an integrative 'reality-memory-trauma-seduction-defense-fantasy-Oedipal-wish-transference-id-ego-superego-lifepath-deathpath-impulse-drive-splitting-of-the-ego' quantum entanglement 'network' of inter-connected theories. (I replaced the words life and death 'instincts' with 'life and death-path impulse-drives' just to make it a little more 'palatable' to me -- and I imagine -- most of my readers.

We will develop the new concepts and theories that I have articulated here for the first time -- and the continuation of the integration between Freudian Pre-Classical and Classical Theory -- in an assortment of upcoming essays.

I think that we have covered more than enough for today.

Cheers!

-- David Gordon Bain

Volume SPI Issue 1 October 2017

©All rights reserved by David Gordon Bain.